



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/046,761 | 01/17/2002 | Richard Nils Dawson | 839-1164 | 2685 |
| 30024 | 7590 | 03/09/2004 | EXAMINER | |
| NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C./G.E. 1100 N. GLEBE RD. SUITE 800 ARLINGTON, VA 22201 | | | PHAN, THIEM D | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3729 | |

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

10/046,761

Applicant(s)

DAWSON ET AL.

Examiner

Tim Phan

Art Unit

3729

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 13 February 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 15-28Claim(s) objected to: NoneClaim(s) rejected: 14

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☒ Other: See Continuation Sheet

Continuation of 10:

Applicants' remarks filed on February 13th 2004 re traversing Claim 14 are hold not to be persuasive for the following reasons:

Applicants' recitation "... forming a pre-packaged stator section ..." (Cf. Claim 14, line 6) and remarks "... (1) a pre-packaged stator core section and (2) a manually stacked stator core section" (Cf. Remarks filed February 13th 2004, page 10, lines 10 & 11), which is well known to be old art, even by Applicants' own disclosure (CF. Applicants' disclosure, page 1, lines 25 & 26).

That is, one of skill in this art would understand without undue skill that manually prepackaging stator core or casting or molding a block of stator core is equivalent to simplifying, time-saving and easy means to mount a rotor/stator core to a shaft of a motor, thus saving all expenses of installing similar lamination one sheet at a time in motor production. Applicants wish to have patent protection for a pre-packaged stator core method of applying individual block of stator core in the manufacturing. One would just as well use a casting, molding or stacked/sealed laminations for rotor/stator core block in motor production and would these later four types of rotor/stator core block, which are well known as old art, be patentable ?

It appears that Applicants fail to recognize the scope of the claims when judged in view of C. T. Hibbard (US 1,685,054) and Applicants' own disclosure (CF. Applicants' disclosure, page 1, lines 25 & 26). (Cf. In re Geuns, 26 USPQ 2nd 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993)).

Furthermore, the Patent Office saith not.




CARL J. ARBES
PRIMARY EXAMINER